



Policy Brief

Increasing Access to Preschool: Recommendations for Reducing Barriers to Providing Full-day, Full-year Programs

- Research confirms that effective preschool not only prepares children for kindergarten, but benefits them in the long-term
- Only 48% of three- and four-year-old children attend preschool in California
- 74% of requests to child care resource and referral programs were for care greater than 30 hours a week
- To better align with working families needs and increase the state's preschool attendance rates, more full-day, full-year program options must be made available

Families Need More Full-day, Full-year Care for Their Youngest Children

More than ever before, Californians recognize that preschool provides young children with a strong start in school and life. Research confirms that effective preschool not only prepares children for kindergarten, but benefits them in the long-term: children who attend high quality preschool are more likely to graduate from high school, less likely to be involved in crime and more likely to earn higher wages as adults.¹

Despite the clear benefits of preschool, only 48%, or about 528,000, three- and four-year-old children attend preschool in California.² While all families want to provide their children with the best early learning opportunities possible, there are a number of barriers that can make preschool impossible: cost of care, waiting lists, lack of transportation to and from preschool centers, and the need for full-time care.

While some families need part-day preschool programs, the half-day schedule can be challenging for other families. Since the majority of parents who have children under age six work outside of the home, it is no surprise that many families need full-day, full-year care for their youngest children.³ In fact, the 2007 California Child Care Portfolio reports that 74 percent

Full-day, full-year preschool programs generally provide families with 6.5 to 10.5 hours of care and education per day, for at least 246 days per year.

of child care requests to resource and referral programs were for care greater than 30 hours a week.⁴ As of September 2007, there were approximately 80,000 three to five-year-old children actively waiting for state funded early care and education services, and of all the children waiting for subsidized services, more than three-quarters required full-time care.⁵

Full-day, full-year preschool programs also benefit young children's learning and development. Indeed, a recent study by the National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER) found that full-day preschool was effective at closing the achievement gap for four-year-olds whose literacy and mathematics skills were far behind national norms upon entering preschool.⁶

To help more working families and ultimately increase the state's preschool attendance rates, more full-day, full-year options must be made available for the families that need such services. Given California's current budget crisis, assisting preschool providers to utilize existing funding sources to expand full-day, full-year services is a realistic policy step for the near future.

This brief provides recommendations for increasing full-day, full-year preschool opportunities, as well as background information on barriers that providers face when coordinating funding streams, and past efforts to address such challenges.

Coordinating Funding to Create Full-day, Full-year Services Presents Significant Challenges

Although California has historically invested in early care and education opportunities for its young children, differing priorities and a lack of sufficient resources has resulted in creating and expanding categorical programs that oftentimes operate separate from each other.

Definitions

Braiding: Funds from two or more programs are coordinated or "braided" to pay for the various expenditures of a full-day preschool program. This requires tracking expenditures by funding source.

Blending: Funds from two or more programs are integrated or "blended" in order to pay for the total expenditures of a full-day preschool program.

There are currently eleven publicly funded early care and education programs functioning within the state, including three major programs administered by the California Department of Education (CDE) that serve preschool-age children: State Preschool, General Child Care and Development, and Prekindergarten and Family Literacy.⁷ Many early care and education providers coordinate (braid) and/or integrate (blend) funding streams for these distinct preschool programs in order to provide full-day, full-year options to a portion of the families they serve. Funding for Head Start, a federal program, and CDE-contracted programs like State Preschool is also commonly braided and/or blended for this purpose.⁸ Some agencies also successfully utilize funds from programs such as federal Title I Preschool or the CDE Alternative Payment Program in combination with CDE preschool funding.⁹

CHART 1: Differences between Preschool Programs that Complicate Braiding and Blending*

Key Requirements	State Preschool	General Child Care and Development	Head Start
ELIGIBILITY			
Intake Eligibility	Family adjusted income at or below 75% of State Median Income: up to \$45,228 for family of 3	Family adjusted income at or below 75% of State Median Income: up to \$45,228 for family of 3	Family adjusted income at or below 100% of federal poverty guidelines: Up to \$17,600 for family of 3**
Need Eligibility	Not required	Parent(s) must be employed, seeking employment, in vocational training, seeking permanent housing or incapacitated	Not required
Length of Eligibility	Eligibility verified annually	Eligibility recertified at least once a year	Eligibility counts for 2 enrollment years
QUALITY MEASURES			
Staff Qualification	Must meet California Code of Regulations Title 5 Requirements	Must meet California Code of Regulations Title 5 Requirements	Must meet California Code of Regulations Title 22 (<i>Recent federal law requires at least 50% of teachers nationwide have a BA degree by 2013</i>)
Staffing Ratios	1 Teacher/24 Children (Adult/Child ratio of 1:8)	1 Teacher/24 Children (Adult/Child ratio of 1:8)	1 Staff/20 Children (Adult/Child 1:8)
REPORTING			
Fiscal Reports	Attendance and Fiscal Report CDFS 8501 (quarterly)	Attendance and Fiscal Report CDFS 9500 (quarterly)	Financial Status Report SF 269 (twice a year, plus yearend report)
Audits	Financial and compliance audit (yearly)	Financial and compliance audit (yearly)	Independent audit (yearly)

* This list includes examples of requirements that are different between preschool programs, but is not exhaustive.

** Subject to the specifics of the implementing regulations, the new Head Start Reauthorization Act allows up to 35% of children served by an agency to have family incomes between 100%-130% of the federal poverty level.

Although many agencies choose to braid and/or blend resources in order to create full-day, full-year programs, the process of coordinating categorically separate funding streams is far from easy. Reconciling differences in program eligibility requirements and quality measures can impact program design and implementation, while fulfilling distinct accounting and reporting requirements can significantly increase an agency's administrative workload. Such challenges create a disincentive for providers to implement full-day services by braiding and/or blending funding streams.

Making Braiding and Blending Easier: Past and Current Efforts

There have been previous efforts to facilitate more fiscal collaboration between early care and education programs, particularly Head Start and CDE programs.

Agencies must often make difficult choices when deciding which program to apply for and whether or not to braid and/or blend with another program. For example, agencies with CDE-funded programs who may want to also utilize Head Start funds have to decide whether to primarily serve families with incomes within 100 percent of the federal poverty guidelines, which govern Head Start. Such programmatic considerations may act as a disincentive to utilizing state and Head Start funds in combination, and preclude services for some needy families.

In 2002, the Child Development Division (CDD) of the CDE, assisted by the California Head Start–State Collaboration Office, created the Collaborative Partners Work Group. This workgroup identified three common models of coordination between Head Start and CDE-contracted programs, and established a list of actions needed to eliminate barriers to those types of partnerships. However, many of the challenges the group's recommendations sought to address still remain.¹⁰

CDD has continued to work on resolving these barriers, recently releasing draft regulations related to State Preschool and Head Start collaborations.¹¹ The Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, commonly known as the Head Start Reauthorization Act, provides further opportunities for collaboration around full-day, full-year services. It not only calls for continued state level cooperation between Head Start and the CDE, but actually requires local Head Start agencies to work with state funded preschool providers in their local service areas to review and coordinate program services.¹²

In addition to increasing and facilitating coordination between Head Start and state contracted programs, many preschool and other early care and education advocates, program administrators and educators, and CDD staff have expressed interest in expanding efforts to create full-day, full-year services by reducing barriers to braiding and/or blending funding streams from the full range of publicly funded early care and education programs.

California Department of Education:

Facilitating Better Coordination between State Preschool Programs

The California Department of Education (CDE) has three major programs that serve preschool-age children: State Preschool, General Child Care and Development, and Prekindergarten and Family Literacy. State Preschool and Prekindergarten and Family Literacy are primarily part-day programs that have limited funding for full-day options. General Child Care and Development provides full-day services, but has insufficient funding to meet the demand for these services.

The Child Development Division (CDD) of the CDE has been actively working to find ways to increase providers' ability to coordinate various CDE funding sources. In February of 2008, the CDD posted *Management Bulletin 08-01*, which provides guidance to agencies affected by AB 172, legislation passed in 2006 that establishes the Prekindergarten and Family Literacy Program and encourages participating providers to implement full-day, full-year programs.¹³ Specifically, the bulletin notifies State Preschool and Prekindergarten and Family Literacy providers that also have General Child Care and Development contracts about the annual process by which they can combine those funding streams under one contract, eliminating dual reporting and audit requirements.

Additionally, the CDE co-sponsored AB 2759 (Assemblymember Jones), which was signed into law by Governor Schwarzenegger in September of 2008.

The bill consolidates and reforms the state's existing child development programs for preschool-age children.¹⁴ Similar to recommendations issued by State Superintendent of Public Instruction Jack O'Connell's P-16 Council, AB 2759 combines statutory and regulatory requirements for these programs, thereby eliminating much of the administrative burden that providers can face when braiding the various programs.

Successful Collaboration Example #1

Options, a child care agency that provides early care and education services in the Los Angeles San Gabriel Valley, received an expansion of its Head Start grant ten years ago. This was due to a federal initiative that encouraged Head Start grantees to combine Head Start and state or local funding to provide full-day, full-year services, and Options utilized CDE State Preschool funding for the collaboration. Rather than use both sources of funding to enhance services for a limited amount of children, Options combined Head Start and CDE resources to primarily expand the number of children it was serving. The agency currently operates 14 dual-funded preschool classrooms that provide full-day, full-year care in nine school districts. Open from 6:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., these collaborative programs serve 280 children.

First 5 California:

Recognizing the Need for Full-day, Full-year Preschool

First 5 California has funded nine First 5 County Commissions to provide high quality preschool programs through the Power of Preschool (PoP) Demonstration Program.¹⁵ Using a mixture of local Proposition 10 revenues, matching funds

awarded by First 5 California, and funds from community partners, these County Commissions have explored avenues for increasing the quality and availability of preschool opportunities in their respective counties.

Successful Collaboration Example #2

San Mateo County Office of Education (SMCOE) has held a State Preschool contract with the CDE for over 16 years, and added a Prekindergarten and Family Literacy Program contract in fiscal year 2007-2008. Rather than provide direct preschool services, SMCOE subcontracts with approximately eighteen “expert agencies” throughout the county for classroom operations, including non-profit organizations, Head Start centers, municipalities and school districts. This practice facilitates the braiding and blending funding streams, because many of the subcontractors also independently hold State Preschool and General Child Care and Development contracts with the CDE. As the lead agency for San Mateo County’s Preschool for All program, SMCOE utilizes First 5 PoP funding to enhance preschool services for five of these subcontractors, and 24 percent of the PoP enhanced spaces are full-day, full-year. Currently 1200 unduplicated children are being served through SMCOE contracts.

While some counties directly fund additional part-day preschool spaces within Head Start or state funded programs, most PoP Demonstration Programs have focused on braiding First 5 PoP funding with Head Start and state funding streams to enhance, or raise the quality of, existing part-day preschool services. However, in developing the PoP program, First 5 California recognized that some families need full-day, full-year options, and therefore included full-day care as criteria for review in the Request for Applications (RFA) for PoP matching grants.¹⁶

Currently, eight First 5 PoP counties utilize a variety of funding mechanisms to extend hours of care for some preschool children.¹⁷ Out of the 579 preschool sessions offered in all nine counties, 124 PoP funded half-day preschool sessions also provide full-day, full-year services to some participating children.¹⁸ Many agencies use Head Start or General Child Care and Development funds to create full-day opportunities, while others have pursued innovative models to extend hours of care, such as offering playgroup sessions or encouraging the use of family child care homes before and after preschool hours. However, these alternative models rarely provide the consistent full-day, full year services that families need. As a result, the First 5 Association of California, a separate entity that

supports the efforts of First 5 California and all 58 First 5 County Commissions, has been exploring various policy approaches to expand the availability of full-day, full-year preschool opportunities.

State and Local Early Care and Education Experts Dig Deeper: Identifying Barriers and Providing Recommendations

In order to further assess the complexities of braiding and blending diverse funding streams, Children Now and the California Child Care Resource and Referral Network completed a series of informal and formal meetings with early care and education experts from around the state.

These stakeholders identified several fiscal, programmatic and regulatory challenges to coordinating and integrating funding streams for full-day, full-year care.

Considering previous and current efforts by CDE/CDD, First 5 and other early care and education advocates, and taking into account California's current fiscal reality, Children Now and the California Child Care Resource and Referral Network developed a spectrum of recommendations for significantly reducing existing barriers to providing full-day, full-year preschool programs. Both short and long-term, these suggested steps should be considered in light of the broader ongoing goal: To help more families provide their children with access to early care and education opportunities, the state must increase the number of full-day, full-year options available for California's young children.

To help more families provide their children with access to early care and education opportunities, the state must increase the number of full-day, full-year options available for California's young children.

Barrier 1:

Low Reimbursement Rates Discourage Expansion of Full-day, Full-year Programs

The current state reimbursement rate for early care and education is so low that most agencies cannot afford to expand and/or improve the quality of their programs, especially full-day, full-year services. Currently, the maximum daily Standard Reimbursement Rate for full-day State Preschool and General Child Care and Development Programs is \$34.38 per child in care from 6.5 to 10.5 hours per day. State Preschool contractors who offer two half-day, typically 3-hour preschool sessions may receive \$21.22 per day per child for each session. So while full-day services range from 6.5 to 10.5 hours of care, State Preschool programs offering two half-day sessions may receive \$42.44 for providing less hours of care (typically 6 hours).¹⁹

CDE-funded agencies feel especially stretched thin by the increasing number of programmatic requirements that must be implemented each year. While many of these requirements are valuable, the state does not provide additional resources to fund such new mandates. Given that there is even more work to execute with the exact same budget, many agencies choose to maintain the quality of their services rather than expand their program capacity, despite the clear need for more full-day, full-year options in their communities.

Recommendation 1:

Increase the daily Standard Reimbursement Rate (SRR) for all early care and education programs, part-day and full-day, with particular focus on raising the rate for full-day, full-year care.

Action Needed

- 1) Allow more counties the flexibility to increase the local SRR, utilizing existing funding. Currently San Francisco and San Mateo Counties administer Individualized Child Care Subsidy Pilot Projects, which were established with the goal of increasing access to quality early care and education programs by providing more local control, including the ability to raise the local SRR.²⁰
- 2) Increase the daily SRR for a full-day, full-year session so that it is equivalent to the maximum daily rate for two half-day preschool sessions, with the long-term goal of allocating funding based on cost and hours of care rather than program type.
- 3) Develop an effective campaign to achieve bipartisan support for raising the SRR through the budget process or legislation.
- 4) Advocate for an increase in the total federal and state funding for publicly financed early care and education programs.

Timeline

2008-2012

Barrier 2:

Multiple Contracts and Insufficient Flexibility Dissuade Providers from Increasing Full-day, Full-Year Services

To operate a successful preschool program, early care and education agencies must often administer a number of different public and private contracts. The administrative work associated with taking on additional contracts to provide

more full-day services may dissuade providers from braiding and/or blending funding sources.

Additionally, providers can be wary of taking on state program contracts that do not allow enough flexibility throughout the fiscal year to meet the changing early care and education needs of the families and communities they serve. *Management Bulletin 08-01* permits providers to combine funding streams under one new annual contract in order to create more full-day, full-year services. While consolidating separate contracts into one will alleviate administrative burden, some providers may be hesitant to pursue this option because they are unsure of how many full-day spaces they will need and be able to fill in a timely manner during the contract period.²¹ To avoid potential complications, providers may need more assistance from the CDE from the outset in tailoring a programmatic and fiscal plan that better fits their organization's situation and priorities.

CDE-funded agencies feel especially stretched thin by the increasing number of programmatic requirements that must be implemented each year.

Recommendation 2:

Monitor and support administrative and legislative efforts to consolidate and streamline existing CDE early care and education programs.

Action Needed

- 1) Monitor the implementation of AB 2759 (Jones), including its impact on current CDE braiding and blending procedures. Signed into law in September of 2008, the bill creates the California State Preschool Program by consolidating the three major CDE-contracted programs serving children three to five-years old.
- 2) Work closely with the CDE as it finalizes regulations related to AB 172 of 2006 and AB 1080 of 2007, advocating for the most flexible interpretation of the statutes as possible.
- 3) Assess the current level of interest by CDE-contracted agencies in combining funding streams per *Management Bulletin 08-01* requirements. Consult providers that elected to combine contracts for fiscal year 2008-2009 to determine if the process has been successful or if adjustments are needed.
- 4) Continue to provide technical support to legislative and CDE staff on braiding and blending issues.

Timeframe

2008-2010

Barrier 3:

Lack of Technical Expertise Makes Hefty Reporting and Auditing Requirements Unmanageable

Managing a budget with several funding streams and allocating costs appropriately can be extremely challenging. Some providers do not have accounting staff that fully comprehend the distinct programmatic intent and fiscal complexity of each separate funding stream, nor do they have experience with the accounting and reporting requirements. Upon receipt of a new contract from the CDE, an agency does not receive a formal orientation or training session from the department's Audits and Investigations Division, or from the Child Development Fiscal Services unit of its Fiscal and Administrative Services Division. While there are online resources and technical assistance available, some agency staff members still have difficulty navigating the complex reporting and auditing procedures.²² As a result, some agencies choose not to hold multiple contracts, even when there is a community need and the additional funding might allow expansion of full-day, full year services.

Recommendation 3:

Increase comprehensive training and technical assistance services for accounting and program staff in early care and education agencies.

Action Needed

- 1) Facilitate a collaboration between an organization familiar with the specific administration of CDE contracts, such as the California Child Development Administrator's Association (CCDA), and the CDE's Child Development Fiscal Services unit and its Audits and Investigations Division to develop a comprehensive plan for expanding and delivering training and technical assistance services across the state to enhance local program efforts to blend and braid diverse funding sources. The lead organization should partner with local agencies that can demonstrate successful models of blending and braiding.
- 2) Seek non-general fund resources to initiate collaboration between the lead organization and the CDE and other partner agencies, and implement ongoing training and technical assistance opportunities. When more general fund resources become available, the project should be funded by CDE.

Timeline

2008-2010

Barrier 4:

Confusing Fiscal Practices Make it Difficult to Appropriately Utilize and Accurately Report on Additional Funding Streams

The CDE's Child Development Fiscal Services (CDFS) unit has appeared to sometimes treat third party restricted income (such as First 5 monies or private grants) as revenue to pay for CDE-contracted expenses. In these cases, third party funds are utilized to supplant CDE dollars rather than expand or enhance program services, ultimately lowering an agency's total reimbursement from the state. This practice has discouraged providers from seeking outside funding or coordinating CDE funds with other funding streams that may be considered third party restricted income.

In April of 2008, CCDAA announced that it had successfully reached agreement with the CDE to revise the way third party restricted income is reported and treated in the process of calculating CDE contract earnings. New reporting forms that make it easier for providers to report additional revenue accurately are now available, and CDFS has already conducted two trainings on the new procedures.²³

While there are online resources and technical assistance available, some agency staff members still have difficulty navigating the complex reporting and auditing procedures.

Recommendation 4:

Support efforts by the CDE and the California Child Development Administrator's Association (CCDA) to create a more consistent approach to unrestricted and restricted third party funding.

Action Needed

- 1) Monitor the use of the new CDFS reporting and auditing forms. Determine if more agencies are blending and braiding funding streams due to the agreement, and encourage CDFS to revise the forms as necessary.
- 2) Monitor any future legislative efforts related to clarifying CDE procedures for unrestricted and restricted third party funding. AB 1028 (Caballero), which sought to clarify reporting and auditing procedures around unrestricted funding for CDE-contracted programs, was vetoed in September of 2008.

Timeframe

2008-2010

Barrier 5:

Complications with Utilizing the Centralized Eligibility List Make Expansion of Full-day, Full-year Services Seem Risky

Implementation challenges, as well as insufficient funding of the state’s Centralized Eligibility List (CEL), the state’s “waiting list” for families who qualify for state-subsidized early care and education programs, have made it difficult for agencies in some counties to fully expend their CDE contract funds in a timely manner.²⁴ The most common problem that providers face in utilizing the CEL is finding eligible children for their programs. Given the instability of many families on the CEL, family contact information can change frequently. Upon formally verifying eligibility status, some providers also discover that some families are not actually qualified for state subsidized services. The creation of the CEL has also created challenges for state and Head Start agencies that want to partner to provide full-day programs. While state preschool programs are required to use the CEL to identify families, Head Start programs are not.

The potential of lost funding can create a disincentive for providers to expand services, including full-day, full-year opportunities.

Open spaces that remain unfilled much longer than expected increase a program’s chance of under-earning its contract. Under-earning puts agencies at risk of receiving a reduced contract because the CDE often interprets vacancies as an indication of lower community need. The potential of lost funding can create a disincentive for providers to expand services, including full-day, full-year opportunities.

Recommendation 5:

Improve the capacity of the Centralized Eligibility List (CEL) to support early care and education programs and ensure that it is not a barrier to implementation of full-day, full-year services.

Action Needed

- 1) Encourage the CDE and county CEL administrators to develop an effective system for monitoring and documenting the utility of the CEL, particularly its impact on full-day, full-year services.
- 2) Determine the adequate funding level in each county necessary to update, maintain and administer the CEL in an effective and timely manner, and support efforts to achieve identified funding levels.

- 3) Urge CDE to complete and implement regulations for the CEL, which will facilitate greater access to both full-day and part-day services.
- 4) Improve CEL data related to the need for full-time care.²⁵

Timeline

2008-2011

Recommendation 6:

Conduct a legislative interim hearing to identify remaining regulatory and legislative barriers to braiding and blending funding and increasing access to full-day, full-year opportunities.

Action Needed

- 1) Partner with key legislator(s) to plan and implement a legislative interim hearing. The hearing would bring together representatives from the CDE and First 5, early care and education providers (particularly accounting and program staff) and other experts from the field, and legislative staff.
- 2) Create a working group to further explore issues that arise from the hearing.
- 3) Monitor and support the working group's progress.
- 4) Explore possible legislative and/or budget action to address barriers identified by the working group.

Hearing agenda items should include but not be limited to:

- Review of all related federal and state legislation and regulations
- Identification of alternative interpretations of current statutes that function as barriers
- Analysis of alternative approaches, such as braiding and/or blending funds from the CDE State Preschool and Alternative Payment Programs, including license-exempt care.

Timeline

2008-2010



Endnotes

1. Lawrence J. Schweinhart et al., *Lifetime Effects: The High/Scope Perry Preschool Study Through Age 40* (Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Press, 2004).
2. Children Now analysis of data from the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey 1% Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) 2007, as accessed through IPUMS, a project of the Minnesota Population Center, <<http://www.ipums.org/acs/index.shtml>> (October 3, 2008).
3. Population Reference Bureau, "Children under Age 6 with All Available Parents in the Labor Force," *KIDS COUNT State Level Data Online*, July 2008, <http://www.kidscount.org/datacenter/profile_results.jsp?c=3&r=6&d=1> (July 1, 2008).
4. California Child Care Resource and Referral Network, *The 2007 California Child Care Portfolio*, 2007, <<http://www.rnnetwork.org/publications/2007/revised-portfolio-2007.pdf>> (March 21, 2008). Data collected from local resource and referral agencies represents a sampling of calls from thousands of parents over a three month period in 2006.
5. CDE, *Status Report on Implementation of County Centralized Eligibility Lists*, November, 2007, <<http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/ci/documents/cellegrpt07.doc>> (March 28, 2008). The report states that 79,768 children between three and five years of age were waiting for child care and development services as of September 30, 2007. A total of 204,063 children (birth to five and school-age children) were waiting for services, with 76.5 percent requiring full-time care.
6. NIEER, *Is More Better? The Effects of Full-Day vs. Half-Day Preschool on Early School Achievement*, May, 2006, <<http://nieer.org/resources/research/IsMoreBetter.pdf>> (May 15, 2008).
7. RAND Corporation, *Early Care and Education in the Golden State: Publicly Funded Early Care and Education Programs for California Preschool-Age Children* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2007). Programs include Title 1 Preschool, Head Start, CalWORKS Stage 1, 2 and 3, CalLearn, Alternative Payment (non-CalWORKS), State Preschool (part-day and full-day), General Child Care and Development, Prekindergarten and Family Literacy (part-day and full-day), Migrant Child Care and Development, Cal-SAFE, and First 5 Power of Preschool Demonstration Programs.
8. 67 percent of California Head Start agencies also contract with the CDE. California Head Start Association, "The 2008 California Head Start Fact Sheet", <<http://caheadstart.org/2008%20CA%20Head%20Start%20Fact%20Sheet.pdf>> (June 16, 2008).
9. To be eligible for state funded half-day preschool services, families must meet income eligibility guidelines, while they must be both income and need eligible to qualify for full-day, full-year services.
10. CDE, *Full-Day, Full-Year Early Care and Education Partnerships—Recommendations of the Collaborative Partners Work Group* (Sacramento, CA: CDE, 2002).
11. CDE, "Notice of Proposed Rulemaking", August 15, 2008, <<http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/lr/rr/stpreschoolnot.asp>> (September 10, 2008).
12. Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, <<http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bill.xpd?bill=h110-1429>> (June 13, 2008).
13. CDE, "Management Bulletin 08-01", February, 2008, <<http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/ci/mb0801.asp>> (February 22, 2008). AB 172 added Section 8239 to the California Education Code (EC), which states that the State Superintendent of Public Instruction shall encourage participating providers to offer full-day services through a combination of part-day preschool slots and part-day general child care and development programs. AB 1080, passed in 2007, modified EC Section 8239 for clarity.
14. Children Now also co-sponsored this legislation.
15. Currently, First 5 California funds nine Power of Preschool (PoP) Demonstration Programs in Los Angeles, Merced, San Diego, San Francisco, San Joaquin, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Ventura and Yolo Counties with the goal of improving preschool access, quality and the delivery system. The funding is designated for new and improved preschool spaces in school district(s), city, or countywide preschool systems. See, <http://www.ccfc.ca.gov> for more information.

16. As part of the application process, First 5 County Commissions requesting PoP Demonstration Program grants were asked to “describe and provide assurances that a variety of public and private funding mechanisms will be available, including a description of fees if applicable, to support wrap-around childcare.” First 5 California, “First 5 Preschool Demonstration Project RFA”, November, 2005: 28.
17. The PoP Demonstration Program in San Joaquin County has not reported funding part-day preschool programs that also provide full-day, full-year services to some participating children.
18. Children Now Interview with Carmen Padilla, Child Development Consultant, First 5 California, August 29, 2008.
19. Denise Ducheny, “Budget Act of 2007”, August 24, 2007, <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/07-08/bill/sen/sb_0051-0100/sb_77_bill_20070824_chaptered.html> (September 8, 2008).
20. Legislation was passed in 2003 for San Mateo County and in 2005 for San Francisco County that allowed flexibility to use child care subsidies however appropriate to address local needs. The most recent annual report by San Mateo County indicates that its pilot program led to an increase in full-day preschool services in 2006-2007. SPHERE Institute, *San Mateo County Individualized Child Care Subsidy Pilot Annual Report 2006-2007* (Burlingame, CA: SPHERE, 2008).
21. Filling preschool spaces, whether full-day or part-day, can be difficult for agencies because of the way the state’s early care and education system is currently structured. See barriers 1 and 5 for more information.
22. The CDD periodically offers optional trainings on a number of topics, including fiscal and administrative procedures for center-based programs. The division also provides online resources, including an annually updated handbook, “Child Development Attendance and Fiscal Reporting and Reimbursement Procedures”. Additionally, each child development contractor is assigned a Fiscal Apportionment Analyst and a Child Development Consultant. See, <<http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/ci/>> for more information.
23. See, <<http://www.ccdaa.org/>> for more information.
24. Legislation in 2005 required counties to design, maintain and administer a CEL for families waiting to obtain subsidized child care and development services. See, California Education Code Section 8227 for more information.
25. For example, a question should be added to CEL that explicitly asks families about their need for full-day, full-year care for children of specific age categories (0-2, 3-5 and school-age).

Acknowledgments

Children Now and the California Child Care Resource and Referral Network gratefully acknowledge The David and Lucile Packard Foundation for their generous support of this work.

This document was written by Kate Miller (Education Policy Associate, Children Now), with support from Giannina Perez (Senior Policy Associate, Children Now), Donita Stromgren (Public Policy Director, California Child Care Resource and Referral Network) and Patty Siegel (Executive Director, California Child Care Resource and Referral Network).

Children Now is a nonpartisan research and advocacy organization working to raise children's well-being to the top of the national policy agenda. The organization focuses on ensuring quality health care, a solid education and a positive media environment for all children. Children Now's strategic approach creates awareness of children's needs, develops effective policy solutions and engages those who can make change happen.

California Child Care Resource & Referral Network's mission is to provide leadership and vision for the continuous development and improvement of resource and referral services statewide, helping to build, support, and advocate for a quality childcare system that supports the diversity of families and children in every community in California.